



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Seventy-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society.

The Seventy-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society was held at the Society's office, 31 Beacon Street, Boston, at two o'clock in the afternoon, May 18.

The President, Hon. Robert Treat Paine, presided.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Edward Everett Hale.

It was voted to omit the reading of the records of the last meeting.

The Secretary reported that all those elected to official position in the Society at the last Annual Meeting had accepted.

It was voted that the Chair appoint a Committee of three to present to the meeting nominations for officers for the coming year. The Chair appointed Dr. William A. Mowry, Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead and Mr. Everett O. Fisk.

The report of the Committee appointed last year on the Teaching of History in the Public Schools was briefly presented by the Chairman, Dr. Homer B. Sprague. The report was approved. (See the Report in the May ADVOCATE OF PEACE.)

It was voted that the Committee on the Teaching of History in the Public Schools be continued, that Prof. Bliss Perry be added to it, that it have full power to add to its numbers, and to carry on and extend its work at its discretion.

The Treasurer's Report was then presented. It showed that the receipts of the year from memberships, subscriptions, sales of literature, contributions, income of the Permanent Peace Fund, legacies, etc., had been \$7,840.16; that the expenditures for salaries, rent of office, printing, mailing, traveling expenses and sundries had been \$5,996.20, making an excess of receipts over expenditures of \$1,843.96. This, plus the balance of last year, \$2,128.36, made a balance of \$3,972.32 in the Treasurer's hands May 1, 1906. Of this sum \$2,338 had been placed in the Building and Endowment Fund, leaving \$1,634.32 in the General Expense Account, \$494.04 less than the balance of last year.

The Report of the Auditor was also read, and both reports were accepted and ordered placed on file.

The Nominating Committee then reported the names of persons to serve as President, General Secretary, Treasurer, Auditor, Vice-Presidents and Board of Directors. (The list is given in full on page of this issue.) The persons named were unanimously elected.

Of the Directors chosen, Rev. James L. Tryon and Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews were new; of the Vice-Presidents, Hon. Richard Bartholdt and President David Starr Jordan.

The Annual Report of the Board of Directors was

then presented by Secretary Trueblood. Remarks upon the Report were made by Edwin D. Mead, President Paine and Mrs. Mead. It was voted that the Report be accepted, approved and printed in the ADVOCATE OF PEACE and in pamphlet form. (The Report is printed in full elsewhere in this issue.)

The following resolution was presented by Rev. Charles F. Dole and seconded by Mr. Edwin D. Mead:

"Whereas, The British House of Commons has unanimously passed a resolution asking that the reduction of national armaments shall be made one of the specific subjects to be discussed at the approaching Conference at The Hague; and,

"Whereas, The American people are bound by all their traditions and principles, as well as by their interests, to take the side of peace and goodwill among the nations; therefore,

"Resolved, That at this annual meeting of the American Peace Society we earnestly petition the Congress of the United States to make no new appropriations for battleships, at least until after the meeting of the Hague Conference.

"We believe that by this postponement of new naval appropriations our government will give the most important, effective and honorable form of aid to the movement for which the Hague Conference was originally called, namely, the relief of the peoples of the world from the enormous burdens of military and naval expense, and the substitution of the reasonable and civilized methods of arbitration for the wasteful, ineffective and barbarous arbitrament of the sword."

The resolution was unanimously adopted and ordered sent to the United States Senators from Massachusetts, to Congressman McCall, to the Chairmen of the Committees on Foreign and Naval Affairs of both Houses of Congress.

A letter from Otto Spengler, Secretary of the New York German Peace Society, to President Paine was read. It was voted that the following greeting of the American Peace Society be sent by the President to the German Peace Society of New York City:

"The AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, the oldest Peace Society in America, sends cordial greetings, at its annual meeting to-day, to our energetic auxiliary, the GERMAN PEACE SOCIETY of New York, and rejoices at their notable effort to promote an arbitration treaty between the United States and the great nation which we so highly honor. We gladly acknowledge America's indebtedness to the leadership of Germany in intellectual life. May the relations of these two nations grow steadily more cordial."

The Secretary announced that the Board of Directors had arranged for the Annual Dinner of the Society at the Twentieth Century Club, 3 Joy Street, at 6.30 in the evening, and that the addresses of the evening would be delivered by Hon. Richard Bartholdt, Member of Congress from Missouri, and Mr. Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

The meeting, which was the largest held for many years, then adjourned.

### THE ANNUAL DINNER.

In the evening at half past six o'clock the Annual Dinner of the Society took place at the rooms of the Twentieth Century Club. One hundred and sixteen persons sat down to the tables, and the whole occasion was one of rejoicing as well as of profit. It bore witness,

in its own peculiar way, to the vastly increased interest now taken in the peace movement compared with former years. The special guests of the evening were Hon. Richard Bartholdt, President of the Interparliamentary Group in Congress; Mr. Bliss Perry, editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* and newly elected professor of English literature at Harvard, and Mr. Robert L. O'Brien, editor of the *Boston Transcript*.

At the speaking after the dinner Hon. Robert Treat Paine, President of the Society, presided. On opening the exercises he said:

*Friends and Adherents to the Great Cause of Peace:* It is my privilege and joy to bid you a cordial welcome to this our annual banquet, on this great day, the 18th of May, one of the red-letter days in the history of the world. We are glad to celebrate it and to feel its strength and inspiration. If at times we are a little discouraged at the slowness with which our cause moves, I think that very divine discontent is one great proof that our cause is really advancing with great rapidity. Remember that a year ago we were listening with eager ears for that terrible naval battle in the distant east. If we go back two years I believe our American Peace Society was just issuing a memorial to the President, in the hope that something might be done to stop that dreadful war. To-day the world is at peace, with not a cloud in the sky, and the great question which occupies our thoughts and is interesting the whole world is: What can be made to grow out of and develop from the Second Hague Conference?

It is not my duty here to-night to do more than give you this cordial welcome, and then to introduce the speakers. Let me first tell you with what pleasure it is that we have with us the Hon. Richard Bartholdt, member of Congress from Missouri [applause], the founder and leader of the group of the Interparliamentary Union in our own Congress. I wonder if it is exaggeration to say that this organization, the Interparliamentary Union, is one of the most interesting and important bodies of public men in the world. I believe I am right in saying it is wholly voluntary. It has no government authority. It is composed of leading men, public-spirited men, in the different parliaments of the world, who gather usually each year in some one of the capitals of Europe, to guide and promote legislation in the interest of peace and arbitration. Mr. Bartholdt has been the leader in our own Congress in this respect. He is very much interested in the movement for arbitration, for a general arbitration treaty. But it is not for me to put words into his mouth, but only to give you an opportunity of seeing and welcoming him—the Hon. Richard Bartholdt. [Applause.]

#### Address of Hon. Richard Bartholdt.

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I thank you for this most cordial reception. I realize that to preach the gospel of peace at Boston is—pardon the harsh word—about like talking war in an armory or military camp, and for me to attempt it is like the endeavor of a pupil to instruct the preceptor. Boston and peace form an association of ideas which to the rest of us—and there are a few of us living beyond the mountains [laughter]—seems as perfectly natural as is the com-

bination of apple trees and apples. You are proud of your city, proud of your history, and justly so, but to my mind your proudest distinction emanates from that "Cradle" which is your own, and in which were born the ideas which have brought us together here to-night. [Applause.] This distinction and the reputation of having kept the holy fires ablaze all these years, you would not be willing, I am sure, to part with for all the glories of the earth.

It has been my heart's desire for years to address a Boston audience on the peace question, even at the risk of carrying water to the ocean, and to-night I esteem it a high privilege to have the opportunity to do so. Not that I can hope to advance any new ideas, or to contribute anything original, to the academic discussion of the subject. I have merely responded to the invitation of my good friend, Dr. Trueblood, in order to show you that, though I have been—to borrow a phrase from the lexicon of war—on the firing-line for several years, I have survived, and am well and hearty, thank you, and more strongly convinced than ever of the righteousness as well as the practicability of our great cause. [Applause.]

With your permission, I shall claim your attention just long enough to give you my reasons for this conviction. They are, briefly stated, that every argument which has been advanced, or which I have heard advanced, in the intellectual combats of the last ten years,—and those are the only kind of combats I believe in,—every argument made by our opponents to excuse or justify the barbarism of war, has been successfully refuted, while our contentions stand like rocks of eternal truth, untouched and unshaken, and will continue so to stand, unless our opponents are willing to make the damaging admission that our whole civilization and the system of government which to-day obtains in all enlightened countries are a sham and a lie.

We claim that if it is right, if it is good ethics, if it is good law, that courts should settle all disputes between individuals,—and this is what our system of government demands,—then it must also be right, and good ethics, and good law for courts to settle all difficulties between nations. [Applause.] What is law for an individual we claim should be law for a nation. A very high authority—I do not care to mention his name—has recently attempted to answer this argument. The question was asked: If not, why not? Law for an individual should be law for a nation; if not, why not? That great authority says, in substance, that private citizens can have their rights defended by force, by the sheriff's posse, by the militia, by the army if need be; but nations cannot have their rights defended in the same way because there is no force behind international law. Hence, he claims, there is but little analogy between the two kinds of law.

Our answer is simply: If there is no analogy between national law and international law, there certainly ought to be [applause], and to supply the deficiency is exactly what we are striving for. [Applause.] A perfect agreement between nations would naturally include some force for the purpose of enabling the governments to enforce judicial decisions. But we need not go that far. The history of arbitration itself teaches, if anything, the absolute needlessness of physical force. [Applause.]

Since 1815 more than two hundred international disputes—to be more exact, about two hundred and fifty—have been settled by arbitration, and in each of these cases the contending nations have accepted the verdict without protest, and in no instance has the losing party attempted by force either to evade or to resist the verdict, nor has there been need of force to compel submission to it. What does this signify? It simply means that the combined moral force of public opinion and of a compact between nations is mightier and more effective in the enforcement of judicial decisions than armies and navies. [Applause.] From this practical lesson, my friends, we have a right to conclude that there is as little probability of a nation ever evading or resisting by force a verdict which is rendered against it in the name of all of the nations as there is of a single individual resisting or rebelling against a decision of a court. And so it is with all the arguments that are advanced to prop up the tottering cause of brutal war. All melt like snow in the sun of reason.

But yet we are called “demagogues of peace” (laughter), because we will not at once admit that human blood must be shed whenever there is a conflict between righteousness and peace. Who, may I ask you, is the judge of what is righteous? Is an interested and consequently partial government, is a nation whose passion has been aroused by some unfortunate incident, and whose sense of justice has been blinded thereby, a safer and better judge than a high, impartial tribunal, which deliberately weighs the cause in the scales of justice and eternal right? The question answers itself. It is safe to say that in this enlightened age the sword will never again be drawn unless both contending nations believe themselves to be in the right. Our contention is that, even in these cases, the employment of force, while it may decide the question as to the strength of a nation, can never determine the righteousness of its cause. [Applause.]

But, say our friends, submission to the decrees of a tribunal involves the surrender of sovereignty. Of course it does. But no surrender of authority has ever been or can be made for a nobler cause. No surrender of authority has ever been made for a cause as sacred as is the cause of peace and of justice. Each one of us here, living in a civilized community, must surrender certain natural rights for the boon of living in a community of individuals. We say that governments should do the same for the boon of living in a community of nations. You see, my friends, that in whatever spot we touch the intellectual armor of our opponents we find it vulnerable, and penetrable by the force of reason.

But this is only the negative side. I feel that I should also briefly refer to the positive side of our cause, namely, to the practical steps which have been taken towards the realization of our ideals.

We are on the eve of the second Hague Conference, that congress of nations which has been called both by President Roosevelt and the Czar of Russia, certainly a most significant joining of hands between Russian autocracy and American democracy, and both for one great purpose. Upon this Conference are centred to-day the hopes of the whole human family. What has been done to prepare for the work of this great gathering? The world is at peace, as has been very eloquently said by

your honored chairman, and it is safe to say that the world is ripe for a step forward to a higher plane, to attain a larger and completer civilization.

The Interparliamentary Union, which has been mentioned, has been engaged for some time past in formulating a program, or some of the most important features of a program, for the second Hague Conference. The governments are preparing theirs, but the program to be submitted by the law-makers of the world who compose that great Union will represent, I believe, the wishes, the hopes, the aspirations of the people of the whole world. [Applause.] You will remember, perhaps, that at St. Louis in 1904 the Interparliamentary Union adopted a resolution drafted by your humble servant, declaring for an international arbitration treaty to be concluded by all the powers, and also declaring for a periodic international congress. At the Brussels Conference last year I had the honor to submit, in behalf of the American delegation, a detailed plan for an international congress, and also the draft of a model arbitration treaty, which, I believed, would be acceptable to all the nations, and framed so as to insure its ratification by the United States Senate. I am happy to say that these two propositions were referred to two separate commissions, and according to information which has come to me within the last week, those two commissions are now ready to report. They will make their report to a meeting of the Interparliamentary Council to be held on June 2, and later to the Interparliamentary Conference, which has been called in extraordinary session for August, that is, prior to the Hague Conference. The Conference of the Interparliamentary Union will then pass upon the reports of these two commissions, forward the program of the Union to the several governments, and present it finally to the Hague Conference itself. Time will not permit me to go into the details of the two propositions, but I hope you will bear with me while I try to explain how the commission, appointed to consider the subject of an international congress, has solved the problem. To my mind it is an inspiration.

The second Hague Conference, which is to meet either this fall or next spring, is to be transformed into a permanent International Congress, with meetings periodically and automatically. That Congress is to appoint a permanent council to codify international law, and to insure a continuity of the influence of the Congress. The Interparliamentary Union itself is to be reorganized so as to give it a representative character which would cause it to be regarded as a real international parliament whose resolutions would influence and indeed fashion the action of the permanent Congress. In other words, the delegates of the Union are to form a quasi-legislative adjunct to the Congress, or a lower House. You will see at a glance that in its results this plan is exactly what we Americans stood for at Brussels last summer, namely, an International Legislature of two houses, one to be created and controlled by the executives, and the other by the parliaments or the people. When I compare the manner in which the original suggestions of this plan were received in the Belgian capital with the report of this commission of eminent European statesmen, I am justified in saying—and I hope you will pardon the gratification with which I mention it—that this result has to be regarded in the light of a glorious American

victory. [Applause.] Perhaps, if I may have the time, Mr. Chairman—

PRESIDENT PAINE: Surely, all you wish. We are here to hear you.

MR. BARTHOLDT: I do not know; I am afraid I am trespassing on your patience too long.

DR. TRUEBLOOD: No, you have only just got started.

MR. BARTHOLDT: Perhaps I ought to say a word or two about the proposed arbitration treaty—and this is not in the books. The great problem was to draft a treaty which would pass the United States Senate. The Senate is very jealous of its rights and prerogatives. The Senate of the United States will not concede to the President a prerogative which, it seemed, historically belongs to him. Hence, when the ten treaties signed by Mr. Hay were before the Senate, that body amended them, and the President would not accept them in the amended form. In my humble judgment, that was a blessing in disguise, because those treaties did not go far enough. They were patterned after the treaty between France and England, and diplomatic relations between France and England had, up to recently, been such as not to encourage the hope that all questions could be submitted to arbitration. Those treaties, which the President finally left unacted upon, exempted three classes of questions from arbitration, namely, all those touching the national honor, those touching the integrity of the nations, and vital interests. It is evident that every question which might come up between nations might be construed to be a question of national honor, or a question touching vital interests. Hence, in my judgment, these treaties were of no great value. The problem was to draft a treaty which could pass the Senate, and we thought we had solved the problem in this way, by providing in the preamble for the territorial integrity of each country signing it. That would remove from the scope of contention a number of very intricate problems and questions. In the first section the questions are specified which should be submitted to arbitration. When, therefore, the Senate approves such a treaty as this, it will give full power of action to the President, so that the real benefit of arbitration can be preserved. We must remember, my friends, that if arbitration is to be useful it must be resorted to in time, not after the passions of the people have been aroused, but promptly, when the question comes up. If we should allow every difficulty that might arise between the United States and another nation to go to the Senate, there to be threshed out for weeks and weeks, why, naturally the American people might become impatient or indignant and force the hand of the government, and arbitration might fail. But if the President has a right, as soon as a question comes up, to arbitrate it, the question can be settled possibly before the people are really aware of what is going on.

The third section of the arbitration treaty provides that in case of questions in which the national honor is involved, the contending nations shall have the right to appoint a commission of inquiry; in other words, to refer the case to a joint high commission for investigation. The nations are not to bind themselves by the verdict of that commission, but the commission shall give the result of its investigation to the world. That done, not only will time be gained, but the light will be let in upon the

intricacies of the question. The principals can then discuss it intelligently, and it is quite certain that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred after this is done war will be averted.

The world is slowly but surely rallying around the banners of peace. It gravitates in an ascending line to a higher plane of one common brotherhood, where the shedding of human blood for the sake of trade, or for any other purpose, will be regarded as a relic of barbarism, and where the three watchwords of the new world-organization will be: Humanity, Justice and Peace. [Applause.] In this onward march the United States is now leading. The Stars and Stripes were hoisted at Brussels as an emblem of progress and hope, and the people of Europe are ready, aye, anxious, to rally around the same flag at The Hague. The question is: Will the government of the United States be true to American traditions, and will it speak the redeeming word at The Hague? I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

In answer to a question from Secretary Trueblood, Mr. Bartholdt then briefly told of the effort which had just been made in Congress to put off the construction of the new ten million dollar battleship until after the second Hague Conference. He had offered the following amendment to the Navy bill:

"Provided, however, that if at the second Hague Conference, to be held within the next twelve months, any measure should be adopted for the limitation of the naval forces of the great powers, or for the settlement of international controversies by judicial decision and by means of arbitration treaties, the Secretary of the Navy shall have discretion to defer the construction of the ship herein provided for."

He had told the members of Congress how ridiculous it would be, if an agreement should be reached at The Hague to settle all of the difficulties between nations by arbitration, for our government to be bound by act of Congress "to go ahead with the construction of that monster of the seas." The government, he had argued, should be left in a position to adjust itself to such conditions as the Hague Conference might give rise to. But the war party was too strong, and his amendment was voted down. He was not, he said, in favor of building any more battleships, though he had voted this time reluctantly for the naval bill out of deference to the Administration, and he had the reassuring information to give that out of the one hundred and thirty-five members of Congress who had voted for this monster of destruction at least seventy-five had declared that this was the last battleship for which they were going to vote. [Applause.] It was difficult, he admitted, when appealed to on the ground of patriotism, when told that the world was arming and that your own country should be protected until the arbitration system was completed, to resist the temptation to vote according to the judgment of "those who claimed to know." Nevertheless, the conviction had gained ground among the Representatives of the people that the navy was already large enough for any legitimate demands of the country, and that a larger fleet of war vessels might prove a menace, in the hands of unscrupulous men, not only to the peace of the world, but possibly also to our own liberties. Even the one big ship was granted only upon the theory that it was absolutely necessary for national defense. It would have been refused if asked for for aggression, for the purpose

of competing with England or other nations in the mad rivalry of armaments. It was the last one, he believed.

Asked by Dr. Ames what prospect there was of disarmament, Mr. Bartholdt said that the Interparliamentary Union was not advocating disarmament as a separate proposition. That, the Union believed, was starting at the wrong end. Armament was the result; they wished to remove the cause. They felt that as soon as the nations were bound together by arbitration treaties, the battleships, the armaments, would go naturally to the junk-shop. [Applause.] Disarmament would come as certainly, as automatically, as the apple falls from the tree, because there would be no more use for armaments. They did not, however, lose sight of the question of disarmament. That appealed to the people who were continually saying: Why don't you reduce the armaments? But the organization of peace, the perfecting of the arbitration system, was the best and speediest way of bringing about what the people desired, relief from the burdens of the great armaments.

PRESIDENT PAINE: May I add one word in the nature of a further answer to Dr. Ames's question how disarmament may be brought about? Nature and Providence seem to be powerfully on our side, as illustrated in that *bon mot* of President Eliot in his recent speech at Tuskegee, when he spoke of these battleships as "short-lived monsters." In a brief period, if we can stop the appropriations for new battleships, the old ones will disappear. [Applause and laughter.]

We are now to have the pleasure of listening to Mr. Bliss Perry, still of Boston, who adds to a brilliant literary career his own recent acceptance of a chair at Harvard. We are delighted to welcome Mr. Perry here to-night, and I have the pleasure of presenting him now.

#### Address of Bliss Perry.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: In the words just uttered the President speaks as if there were some innate contradiction in terms between a literary career and a connection with Harvard College. The persuasive Secretary of the Peace Society asked me to speak for ten minutes after Mr. Bartholdt, and say anything he might leave out. I have accordingly been studying with interest Mr. Bartholdt's diminishing pile of manuscript. I cannot find that he has left out anything essential, particularly after the second speech in reply to Dr. Trueblood's question.

He has, however, left out a word as to the dialectic skill and patriotic fervor with which he has met the hackneyed arguments for war. It is always astonishing to such of us as do not read daily the Congressional Record to see how the trite maxims — the venerable one, "If you wish peace, prepare for war" (which was mildewed and mouldy when Cain reached for his club to hit Abel) [laughter]; the maxim, "Trade follows the flag" (which is a glorious academic maxim until you try to pick out a single sewing machine or mowing machine or pair of shoes that ever did follow the flag); the equally trite maxim that "War develops virtues" (and we know that pestilence and famine and earthquake develop virtues equally fine) — how those maxims have been a part of the arguments with which Mr. Bartholdt and Mr. Burton have been met upon the floor of the House.

Two years ago, while I was dining with some gentle-

men in Cleveland, on the day of Mr. Burton's speech against a further increase of the navy, those men said: "Fine fellow, but that speech will kill him." I could not but think of the famous remark about Mr. Sumner's speech in 1845, made by a very well-known Boston man: "May as well wring his neck, for we shall never hear from him again!" In six years he was a Senator of the United States. Mr. Burton was still living yesterday, and uncommonly vigorous, — and the treatment seems to agree with Mr. Bartholdt.

I have an impression in reading those debates that the gentlemen now working for international arbitration have immense advantages in the constructive nature of their program. It is not mere war against war, a campaign that enlists the sympathy of many of us. It is a campaign for international arbitration, which is a rather different thing from a campaign against war as such. In New England assemblies you can always get a vote from those that are "opposed." But for sixty years in New England — over ninety years, according to Dr. Trueblood — men and women have been saying these same things against war. The practical success, after all, is with the men who have been shifting the emphasis, in the last few years, over upon this constructive program. And I believe it is largely to their tact, as well as to their imagination, that the success of the arbitration movement so far is in large measure due. I say tact first, because I believe that there is no moral reform before us at the present time that requires a more delicate sense of what is fitting, of what will serve in the dealings between man and man, than this cause of patriotism and internationalism.

Mr. Bartholdt wants to hoist the Stars and Stripes at Brussels, and we want to see it, because we are patriots. Some of us feel bad because our own country seems to be lagging behind France and England at the present moment in general enthusiasm for the cause in whose honor we are gathered here to-night. Why regret that? Because we are patriots. We are patriots first, and internationalists because we are patriots.

But if you ask a man to look out over, say Hampton Roads, as I looked out in 1898, when our "flying squadron" was there just before the Spanish War, it would be quite likely that he would think only of America. I had been listening to the debates in the House, and well remember the remark of a member: "We cannot tell from hour to hour when we are to be stampeded." The President and Mr. Reed said: "The stampede is coming, and nobody can tell when." The desks were piled high with copies of the New York *Journal*, that later boasted that it had "made the war." I do not believe that. I think the motives of our country in waging that war were right, mistaken though I personally believe the war to have been. If diplomacy could have settled it, it should have done so. That is an academic question. As we looked out over those waters the day after that debate, there were the Texas, Massachusetts, Brooklyn, Columbia and Minneapolis, in war-paint of gray, and it would have been difficult for any American with any historic sense of the power of his country and the justice of his country to fail to feel a thrill in his heart as he saw that armed force of his country getting ready for action.

But as I turned from the sight of the "flying squadron" to those old white buildings of Hampton Institute, put up by the faith and idealism of a man from my old college,

a gallant and loyal gentleman, if there ever was one, who out of sheer faith in the moral progress of the human race, made up his mind at the close of the war to make something out of nothing, and by the sheer force of that idealism began to pull up the whole of a downtrodden race, I felt that the buildings of Hampton Institute were a finer sight for the patriotic American than the vessels of the "flying squadron." [Applause.]

At the Jamestown Exposition next year, when we are told the main feature will be a naval display, I say, for one, that if the schools and churches and courts of the United States of America, if our respect for law, and our respect for labor, are not emphasized more than our respect and admiration for armed force, then the Jamestown Exposition will be false to the history of this country.

The point I was trying to make is not my own feelings at these contrasted things,—that amounts to nothing,—but my sense of the essential union, after all, between the man who thrills at the sight of the battleship and the man who thrills at the sight of the schoolhouse and what the schoolhouse represents. I do not believe the two men are so far apart as we workers against war are sometimes tempted to think that they are. The man who admires the battleship is not in that moment admiring war. He is not admiring brute force in itself, but looking at one symbol of his country, which for historic reasons, as well as pride and vainglory, touches him very strongly.

We ought to show some of the tact and imagination which workers like Mr. Bartholdt and Mr. Burton have shown in Congress. We should see the other man's point of view. Remember we are looking at two symbols of the same great national life. Some of us feel that it is an immense error to throw the weight of the government and the weight of individual interest so completely on the side of brute force. That it is so difficult to get the other class of men to take this attitude is what constitutes the melancholy element in the present situation. If we can only get these men to feel that the America which we believe the true America is the ideal, the permanent America, and that the great battleship is one of the transient phases destined to disappear with the triumph of this movement, then I do not see why the two sorts of men cannot work together in a common patriotism, and a patriotism which favors a better internationalism. [Applause.]

Mr. Robert L. O'Brien, editor of the *Boston Transcript*, was then introduced, and spoke briefly of the great service which the peace societies are doing in keeping the attention of the people fixed upon the higher and better way of dealing with the differences which arise between nations.

After brief remarks by Secretary Trueblood as to the work of the Society, the exercises closed.

The twelfth annual Mohonk Lake Conference on International Arbitration has just closed its sessions. It was the largest of the arbitration conferences yet held at Mohonk, and generally felt to be a considerable advance over last year. We shall give an extended account of the proceedings in our next issue, including several of the fine speeches delivered.

## Seventy-Eighth Annual Report of the Directors of the American Peace Society.

*Mr. President and Members of the American Peace Society:*

The Board of Directors herewith respectfully submit the Seventy-Eighth Annual Report of the work of the Society, with an account of the general status of the international arbitration and peace movement throughout the world at the present time.

### MEETINGS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

We have as heretofore held regular meetings of the Board every two months, and one adjourned meeting to hear an important report on the teaching of history in the public schools. The meetings have been exceptionally well attended and interesting. We have given attention to the public events of the year specially related to our movement, and also to the regular lines of work carried on through our office. The details given hereinafter show that the year has been one of the most fruitful and encouraging in the history of the Society, and that the cause for which we labor has made steady and marked advance, and now occupies a position of strength and confidence, which, in spite of the many and serious obstacles yet to be overcome, assures a comparatively early and complete triumph of the principles for which the Society has so long labored.

### PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, the monthly organ of our work, has been continued under the editorial direction of the Secretary. Every possible effort has been put forth to make the paper a strong and reliable organ of the international arbitration and peace movement, and many testimonies are received indicating that it is increasingly appreciated. In spite of considerable losses, the list of subscribers has steadily increased, and the edition sent out monthly is now several hundred copies larger than at this time last year. The paper has been sent as heretofore to the reading rooms of all our colleges, universities and theological schools, to several hundred Y. M. C. A. rooms, to many public libraries, etc. Generous contributions from friends have enabled us still to perform this important service, and there is no limit to the work that might be done in this direction if adequate funds were at hand. Through the generosity of the Philadelphia Friends' Peace Association more than two hundred copies of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* are now mailed regularly to missionaries and prominent natives in Japan. The same association also subscribes for a large number of copies for distribution among ministers, normal schools, etc., in this country. The same is true of the Arbitration and Peace Committee of the New York Friends' Yearly Meeting and of a number of private individuals in Massachusetts, New York, Colorado, and elsewhere. A gift of two hundred dollars was received from the Rhode Island Peace Society in the autumn, for this and kindred work.

Owing to the difficulty of securing sufficient patronage to justify its further continuance, it was decided after careful consideration of the subject, and with no little regret, to discontinue for the present the publication of the *ANGEL OF PEACE*, which we have heretofore published for children.